

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

HANNA JABER,

Plaintiff,

CASE NUMBER: 09-11610  
HONORABLE VICTORIA A. ROBERTS

v.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS,  
and DR. PAULA C. WOOD

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration.

On March 7, 2011, the Court granted Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice. The Court held Plaintiff Hanna Jaber's procedural due process rights were not violated when Wayne State University's ("WSU") College of Education Dean Paula C. Wood, without the involvement of the WSU Board of Governors, revoked Plaintiff's doctoral degree after an informal disciplinary hearing, and after concluding Plaintiff plagiarized a substantial portion of her dissertation. On April 6, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion asking the Court to reconsider its ruling dismissing her Complaint.

Under E.D. MICH. LR 7.1(h)(3), "the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication." Accordingly, "[t]he movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons

entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.” *Id.* “A ‘palpable defect’ is a defect which is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain.” *DiPonio Const. Co., Inc. v. Int’l Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers*, 739 F.Supp.2d 986, 1004 (E.D. Mich. 2010) (citation and quotation marks omitted). “The decision whether to grant reconsideration lies largely within the discretion of the court.” *Id.* (citation and quotation marks omitted). A motion brought pursuant to LR 7.1 must be filed no later than fourteen (14) days after entry of the judgment or order. E.D. MICH. LR 7.1(h)(1).

Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is untimely; it was filed more than fourteen days after this Court’s March 7, 2011 Order Granting Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. However, even if the motion had been timely filed, it does not present a basis for reaching a different outcome in this case. Plaintiff presents the same issues ruled on in the Court’s March 7 Order and has not shown that the Court committed plain error.

Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

**IT IS ORDERED.**

s/Victoria A. Roberts  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Victoria A. Roberts  
United States District Judge

Dated: April 26, 2011

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record by electronic means or U.S. Mail on April 26, 2011.

s/Linda Vertriest  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Clerk